

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated April 2, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 10, 12, 19 and 21. No new matter is added. Claims 1-5, 8-15 and 17-21 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 8-15 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that this objection is now believed to be moot in view of the current amendments in claims 1, 10, 12, 19 and 21.

In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 10, 12, 13 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0171792) in view of Mitsui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,408,345) in view of Maeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,123,325) and further in view of Official Notice/ARA (Applicants' Related Art); rejected claims 4, 5, 14, 15 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota et al., Mitsui et al., Maeda et al., and Official Notice/ARA as applied above, and further in view of You (U.S. Patent No. 7,023,508); and rejected claims 8, 9, 11, 17, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota et al., Mitsui et al., Maeda et al., and Official Notice/ARA as applied above, and further in view of Official Notice.

These rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites, for example, a combination of elements, "...the reflective layer not overlapping a region covered by the active layer, the gate electrode, the source electrode and the drain electrode..." Claim 10 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 10 recites, for example, a combination of elements, "...the reflective layer not overlapping a region covered by the active layer, the gate electrode, the source

electrode and the drain electrode...” Claim 12 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 12 recites, for example, a combination of elements, “...the reflective layer not overlapping a region covered by the active layer, the gate electrode, the source electrode and the drain electrode...” Claim 19 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 19 recites, for example, a combination of elements, “...the reflective layer not overlapping a region covered by the active layer, the gate electrode, the source electrode and the drain electrode...” Claim 21 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 21 recites, for example, a combination of elements, “...the reflective layer not overlapping a region covered by the active layer, the gate electrode, the source electrode and the drain electrode...” Applicants amend claims 1, 10, 12, 19 and 21 as above to particularly define the region not overlapping the reflective layer, as the Examiner indicated. Accordingly, Mitsui et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the limitation of the claimed invention, as the Examiner conceded.

For at least the above reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-5 and 8-9, claim 10 and its dependent claim 11, claim 12 and its dependent claims 13-15 and 17-18, claim 19 and its dependent claim 20, and claim 21 are allowable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 

Robert J. Goodell

Reg. No. 41,040

Dated: July 2, 2009

Customer No.: 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202-739-3000

Facsimile: 202-739-3001